



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/882,491	06/15/2001	Yaron Goland	3382-53699	8148
26119 7590 09/04/2008 KLARQUIST SPARKMAN LLP 121 S.W. SALMON STREET SUITE 1600 PORTLAND, OR 97204				
EXAMINER				
SHAW, YIN CHEN				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2139				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/04/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/882,491

Applicant(s)

GOLAND, YARON

Examiner

Yin-Chen Shaw

Art Unit

2139

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 June 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-18, 20 and 21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 2-12 and 21 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 13-18 and 20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/C2)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is responding to the amendment dated on 06/02/2008.
2. Claims 13-18 have been amended. Claim 21 is newly added. All other claims are as original.
3. Claims 2-18 and 20-21 have been examined.
4. Claims 2-18 and 20-21 are pending.

Claim Objections

5. Claim13 is objected to because of the following informalities:

The phrase, "the security resolver with the branding certificate ..." should be "a security resolver with the branding certificate ..." and "a security resolver operational" should be "the security resolver operational ...". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 13-18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hind et al, US Patent No. 6772331B1, hereinafter "Hind", in view of Dondeti et al, US Patent No. 6,263,435, hereinafter "Dondeti" .

a. As per claim 13:

Hind disclose a networked computing device supporting branding to establish cryptographically secured interaction with other deices within a trust group of devices on an open-access network, the networked computing device comprising:

a network interface for communicating on the open-access network, a security initializer operational to receive the branding public key from a branding device securely networked to the networked computing device, and further operational to initialize with the branding public key **[(Col. 9 lines 25-40 from Hind)]**.

Hind does not expressly disclose the remaining limitation of the claim. However, Dondeti discloses the security initializer further operational to initialize the security resolver with the branding certificate and wherein the branding certificate comprises branding key data for verifying certificates provided by other devices within the trust group on the open-access network **[(lines 13-28, Col. 3 and lines 58-67, Col. 4 to lines 1-29, Col. 5 from Dondeti)]**;

a security resolver operational, after being initialized with the branding public key to authenticate trust group membership certificates separate from the

branding certificate provided to the networked computing device from other devices via the network interface using the branding key data and to verify that the other devices providing trust group membership certificates are members of the trust group of devices **[(lines 13-28, Col. 3; lines 1-29, Col. 5 ; Col 10 lines 18-29, Col 11 line 5 to Col 12 line 20 and Col 6 lines 10-55 from Dondeti)]**, and further operational to inhibit interaction via the network interface with other devices not authenticated as in the trust group of devices, the security resolver being initially uninitialized **[(Col 10 lines 18-29, and Col 11 line 5 to Col 12 line 20 and Col 6 lines 10-55 from Dondeti)]**; and the branding device having previously generated the branding public key and trust group membership certificates **[(lines 14-29, Col. 5 from Dondeti)]**.

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention was made for one having ordinary skill in the art to modify Hind's invention to incorporate Dondeti's teaching to implement the group joining between group members without interposing a central authority.

b. As per claim 14:

Hind and Dondeti teach "The networked computing device of claim 13 further comprising: a limited access networking interface; and hwerein the security initializer further is operational to accept the branding public key when

received from the branding device only via the limited access networking interface" in (Col 11 lines 5-45).

c. As per claim 15:

Hind and Dondeti teach "The networked computing device of claim 13 wherein: the security initializer further is operational to accept the branding public key when received from the branding device via the network interface when in an initial unbranded state; and the device further comprises a branding reset operational upon activation to return the security initializer to the initial unbranded state" in (Col 13 lines 35-43).

d. As per claim 16:

Hind and Dondeti teach "The networked computing device of claim 13 further comprising: a branding mode activator operational to place the networked computing device in a branding mode; and wherein the security initializer further operational to accept the branding public key when received from the branding device via the network interface when in the branding mode" in (Col 11 lines 5-45).

e. As per claim 17:

Hind and Dondeti teach "The networked computing device of claim 13 wherein: the security resolver further operational when initialized with a trust group membership certificate to provide the trust group membership certificate to other devices via the network interface to attest to membership of the networked computing in the trust group; and the security initializer further operational to receive the trust group membership certificate from the branding device while securely networked to the networked computing device, and further operational to initialize the security resolver with the trust group membership certificate" in (Col 9 lines 15-65, and Col 10 lines 24-30).

f. As per claim 18:

Hind and Dondeti teach "The networked computing device of claim 13 wherein: the security resolver further operational when initialized with a public/private key pair to encrypt interaction via the network interface with other devices authenticated as in the trust group using the public/private key pair; and the security initializer is further operational to receive the public/private key pair from the branding device while securely networked to the networked computing device, and further operational to initialize the security resolver with the public/private key pair" in (Col 11 lines 5-65).

g. As per claim 20:

Dondeti discloses "The networked computing device of claim 13, wherein:
Each trust group membership certificate is sent by an other device and each
trust group membership certificates comprises:

a signed name for a trust group (Group Name or group ID);

a signed identifier (host public key, Host ID) for the other devices sending the
trust group membership certificate" in (Figure 1, 3); and

"The security resolver is configured to authenticate trust group membership
certificates by:

Authenticating, from the trust group membership certificate, the signed name
for the trust group and the signed identifier for the other device sending the
trust group membership certificate using the branding public key" in (Col 6
lines 10-55); and

Wherein the signed name for a trust group matches the trust group, verifying
that the other device sending the trust group membership certificate is a
member of the trust group" in (Col 5 lines 1-20).

Allowable Subject Matter

8. Claims 2-12 and 21 are allowed.

9. Claims 2 and 21 are allowable based on the Applicant's argument presented in the amendment dated 8/08/2007 and the limitations regarding the membership certificate and the signature-related items associated with it.

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's amendment, filed on Jun. 02, 2008, has claims 13-18 amended. Claim 21 is newly added. All other claims are as original.
11. Applicant's remark, filed on Jun. 02, 2008, argues that the amended Claim 13 should be allowable since it contains similar limitation from already-allowable claim 2.
12. Applicant's remark has been fully considered, but found not persuasive based on the reason below.

Regarding to Argument (1):

In regards to Applicant's argument the amended Claim 13 should be allowable since it contains similar limitation from already-allowable claim 2, Examiner respectfully disagrees with it. The newly added limitation, "a security initializer operational to receive a branding certificate from a branding device securely networked to the networked computing device, the branding device having previously generated the branding certificate and trust group membership

certificates, the security initializer further operational to initialize the security resolver with the branding certificate and wherein the branding certificate comprises branding key data for verifying certificates provided by other devices within the trust group on the open-access network", after careful review and analysis of the prior art, it is found still taught by the combination of Hind reference and Dondeti reference. Please refer to Col. 9 lines 25-40 from Hind and lines 13-28, Col. 3; lines 58-67, Col. 4 to lines 1-29, Col. 5 from Dondeti.

Applicant is reminded that additional modification to clarify the claim limitation regarding the membership certificate and its signed items from the security-uninitialized device is necessary for further consideration.

Conclusion

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- a. Langford et al. (U.S. Patent 6,266,420) disclose a method for securing group communications with reduced message overhead begins by initiating a secure group communication, where a group communication is secured based on security credentials of the group. The secured group communication is then provided to members of the group, where the secured group communication includes a secured message portion and an overhead portion based on the group, not each member. Each

member of the group that receives the message determines that the secured message is group communication for its particular group. Each member then obtains at least a portion of the security credentials (e.g., the private decryption key) of the group to decrypt the secured group communication.

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Y.C. Shaw whose telephone number is 571-272-8593. The examiner can normally be reached on 9-6 (M-F).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu can be reached on 571-272-3859. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 09/882,491

Page 11

Art Unit: 2139

Y.C. Shaw

AU 2139

Aug. 28, 2008

/Kristine Kincaid/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art

Unit 2139